

#### REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, it was indicated that Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. In response, a Replacement Sheet of drawings is presented herewith in which Figs. 1 and 2 have been designated by the legend --Prior Art-- as required in the Action, and it is respectfully submitted that the drawings are now in proper form.

On the merits, claims 1-4 and claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants admitted prior art (AAPA) and specifically Figs. 1 and 2, and the background of the invention, for the reasons of record. In response, independent claims 1 and 5 are herewith amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the patentable features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 5, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are now clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art for the reasons detailed below.

More particularly, it was suggested in the Action that AAPA Figs. 1 and 2, and the background of the invention, anticipate the instant invention as originally claimed. On the contrary, however, it is respectfully submitted that Fig. 3 of the instant application, and the associated description thereof in the instant specification, clearly show and explain the difference between a


prior-art conventional pulse pattern as shown in Fig. 1 and a pulse pattern in accordance with the instant invention, with the conventional pulse pattern being represented by a broken line and a pulse pattern in accordance with the invention being represented by a solid or plain line. A comparison of the two pulse patterns will reveal that the instant invention is clearly not anticipated by Figs. 1 and 2 of AAPA, as the pulse patterns are in fact substantially different. In order to more clearly and precisely recite this difference, independent claims 1 and 5 are herewith amended to more particularly recite that the irradiation means are sequentially pulsed to a high laser current write level from a low laser current level close to zero during the writing period of a recorded mark to produce a plurality of current pulses during the writing period. It is respectfully submitted that this additional limitation more particularly and precisely recites an important patentable distinction between the instant invention and the prior art, as clearly shown in Fig. 3 and the associated description thereof in the specification.

It is emphasized that the instant invention, as now more particularly and precisely recited constitutes an important commercial advance in the art, since information can thereby be recorded on an optical disk while keeping the power dissipation at a reduced level as compared to the prior art. The foregoing advantage is obtained because the average light power being emitted

during writing by the laser diode can effectively remain the same while the average laser current is reduced. An additional advantage of the instant invention is that jitter and crosswrite may be reduced and DOW cyclability increased. The foregoing advantages are detailed in the instant specification at page 2, lines 5-17 and page 6, lines 15-16.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings are now in proper form and the claims, as amended, define an invention which is clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art. Accordingly, allowance of the instant application is respectfully submitted to be justified at the present time, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531  
Attorney  
(914) 333-9630